



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:

HAMMER, et al.

Conf. No. 6422

Appl. No. 10/601,194

Art Unit: 3722

Filed: June 23, 2003

Examiner: W. Fridie

For: **LATHE**

NEW ARGUMENTS UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.114

MS RCE
P.O. Box 1450
Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Commissioner:

Applicants respectfully submit new arguments in further response to the Office Action of July 28, 2006 and in specific response to the Advisory Action of October 23, 2006, wherein the Examiner stated that the new feature of claim 1 requires further consideration. The Examiner objected to the feature reciting "wherein the second tool holder (46) is movable in a controlled fashion vertically in a Z2 direction and horizontally by a second compound slide system" by stating that "there appears to be no structural nexus between the two slide systems to accomplish the claimed synchronicity."

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's comment. Applicant notes that the language of claim 1 reciting "the second tool holder movable in a controlled fashion along two axes by a second compound slide system" is simply a rephrasing of "the second tool holder can be moved in a controlled fashion along two axes by a second compound slide system," which appeared in originally filed claim 1. The Examiner never objected to this original language nor rejected this language under